

### REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of December 10, 2007 in which claims 1-9 were rejected. With this paper, claims 1-9 are amended, new claim 10 is added and none are canceled.

#### Specification

The Office raised the following issues with the specification:

*1. The application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b).*

An Abstract of the Disclosure was submitted with the Preliminary Amendment A on July 16, 2004. With this paper, the Abstract of the Disclosure is resubmitted.

*2. The title of the invention is not descriptive.*

With this paper, a new title is provided. Acceptance of the new title is respectfully requested.

*3. The drawings are objected to because lines are not thick, durable, and black. Lines are in poor quality.*

With this paper, a set of replacement sheets is provided. Acceptance of the replacement drawings is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections under 35 USC 102

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(e) as being anticipated by Bowers (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,634, Bowers hereinafter).

Main claim 1 of the present application pertains to a device for giving an already existing electronic device an auxiliary function as a pointing device. In that device, at least one or more pointing components are integrated in the electronic device, thus

enabling the electronic device to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device.

Bowers discloses a laptop computer comprising a removable trackball/mouse unit as a pointing device. In Bowers, the removable mouse unit is a function unit connected to the laptop and it can only be used with the laptop. It is not an auxiliary function (as a pointing device) of an existing electronic device as is in the present invention. As shown in Figs. 1-7, Bowers discloses the laptop provided with the removable mouse unit. The mouse function is a standard main function of the laptop, and the removable mouse unit is a standard function unit of the laptop. Therefore, the removable unit is neither an auxiliary function nor an auxiliary function unit of an existing electronic device.

Secondly, even if considering that Bowers discloses the laptop as an existing electronic device and the removable mouse unit as the pointing components integrated in the existing electronic device (i.e. the laptop), the present invention is still different from Bowers. Bowers merely discloses the mouse unit (30), that is a detachable part of the laptop (10), controls cursor movement on the screen (24) of the laptop (col. 3, lines 40-44). Such an arrangement does not enable the electronic device (the laptop) to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device (the removable mouse).

Thirdly, with regard to dependent claims, the pointing device components are integrated in an auxiliary unit that is releasably mounted to the electronic device. The auxiliary unit (e.g. a battery pack) performs, in addition to its main function (e.g. power supply), a secondary (i.e. an auxiliary) function as a pointing device (page 2, lines 19-22). The removable trackball/mouse unit of Bowers does not have a main function and an auxiliary function as does in the present invention because the trackball/mouse unit only has a main (standard) function that is a pointing device.

Therefore, Bowers does not disclose a device that at least one or more pointing components are integrated in an existing electronic device, that gives the already

existing electronic device an auxiliary function as a pointing device thus enabling the electronic device to act together with an external electronic screen device, which makes use of the pointing device. Thus, the present invention, as defined in main claim 1 and further in dependent claims 2-9, is not anticipated by Bowers.

Based on the above, applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claims 1-9 based on Bowers be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Applicant's Comments on Other References**

The prior art references Oross (U.S. Patent No. 6,950,563), Yin (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,870) and Miyashita (U.S. Patent No. 6,909,906), made of record and not relied upon, are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure (page 6 of the Detailed Action).

With regard to these documents, Oross discloses 2-part mouse separable each other for the laptop. There is no indication in Oross that the skilled person would prompt to combine teachings of Oross with Bowers in order to arrive at solution disclosed in claim 1.

Yin discloses peripheral device (mouse) to be mechanically connectable to the laptop to be carried as a single unit. There is no indication in Yin that the skilled person would prompt to combine teachings of Yin with Bowers in order to arrive at solution disclosed in claim 1.

Miyashita discloses an input apparatus detachably coupled to the portable device. The input unit operates in normal input mode (e.g. as keyboard) when it is attached to the portable device and in the pointing device input mode when it has been removed from the portable device body (Miyashita col. 11, lines 10-24). If combining teachings of Miyashita with Bowers the skilled person would arrive at solution in which the laptop comprises the trackball/mouse unit that operates in the pointing device input mode only when removed from the lap top, and therefore he would not arrive at solution disclosed in claim 1. On the other hand, if combining teachings of Bowers with

Miyashita the skilled person arrives at solution in which the portable device comprises the trackball/mouse unit that operates in mouse mode when removed from the portable device (Bowers col. 2, lines 18-27). Further the trackball/mouse unit is not an auxiliary unit in the meaning of the invention because its main function is the pointing function as earlier described. Further if combining Bowers and Miyashita the skilled person does not arrive at solution in which the portable device as such makes use of the pointing device as disclosed in claim 1. (If trackball/mouse unit is attached to the portable device and trackball mode is activated, then the portable device as a whole cannot be operated mouse-like in the user's palm). Therefore, the skilled person would not arrive at solution disclosed in claim 1 in view of Bowers and Miyashita.

#### New claims

With this paper, a new claim 10 has been added. The support for the new claim can be found on page 1; lines 34-38 of the instant application.

#### Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of December 10, 2007, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-10, as amended, to issue is earnestly solicited.

Date: March 10, 2008

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, Connecticut 06468  
Tel: (203) 261-1234

Respectfully submitted,



Shiming Wu  
Agent for Applicant  
Registration No. 56,885